

CMER Meeting Notes

2/23/01- NRB- Olympia

The meeting was chaired by CMER co-chair Timothy Quinn, WDFW. The following people attended: Kate Benkert, USFWS; Helen Bressler, WDOE; Ben Carlsen, Boise Cascade; Bill Ehinger, WDOE; Brian Fransen, WEYCO; Jeff Grizzel, WDNR; Craig Hansen, USFWS; Terry Jackson, WDFW; Jeff Light, Plum Creek; Bruce Lippke, UW; Mike Liquori, Campbell Group; Doug Martin, WFPA; Jim McCracken, Longview Fibre; Mark Mobbs, Quinault Tribe; Dave Parks, WDNR; L.N. Pete Peterson, UCUT; Dan Pomeroy, WDNR; Dawn Pucci, Stillaguamish Tribe; Mary Raines, NWIFC; Ken Risenhoover, Port Blakely; Blake Rowe, Longview Fibre; Julie Sackett, WDNR; Dave Schuett-Hames, NWIFC; David Volsen, WDFW.

Miscellaneous Business.

Timothy Quinn introduced Jeff Grizzel, WDNR, as the interim Adaptive Management Administrator. DNR is still attempting to fill the position on a permanent basis.

The process for designating core members was discussed. Until the process for identifying all core members is complete, decisions will be made by all in attendance. The need for a second co-chair was raised. It was decided that it was not appropriate for the Adaptive Management Administrator to fill that role.

Meetings from the last meeting were approved. Introductions were made.

Presentation on Integration.

Mike Liquori gave a presentation on the need for integration of CMER projects around interdisciplinary topic areas and provided a preliminary framework for doing so using Type N stream issues as an example. A handout with slides from the talk was distributed. There was some discussion of whether CMER should get involved in development/refinement of resource objectives and targets. This was followed by a discussion on how to achieve integration of CMER projects. Several people expressed concerns about starting the process over again and proposed that any integration should begin with the existing project lists and workplans prepared by the SAGs. Quinn proposed beginning with the functional groupings of projects being prepared by the individual SAGs, followed by a cross-grouping integration review across the functional groupings. It was decided to move ahead with prioritization from the lists developed by the SAGs and address integration at some point after prioritization.

Project Prioritization. The purpose of this exercise was to identify a slate of priority projects for the coming biennium, and develop a rough estimate of the budget necessary to accomplish them. Each SAG was allowed to bring three projects forward for CMER consideration, with a handout and a brief (30 min) presentation by a representative of the SAG. During the presentations, each individual CMER participant ranked projects on the basis of potential resource impacts, implications to management, scientific uncertainty,

cost, degree of difficulty, timeframe, support for ongoing research, and cooperative contributions. A summary of the presentations follows.

- Eastside riparian scientific advisory group (ERSAG)- Dave Volsen.
 1. Eastside riparian disturbance regimes.
 2. Perennial initiation points (eastside).

This group chose to present only two projects. Since they were a new committee they had only limited time for scoping.
- Riparian scientific advisory group (RSAG)- Blake Rowe.
 1. DFC target validation (westside).
 2. Densimeter protocol development.
 3. Eastside stream temperature model.

The eastside temperature model project would be a joint project with ERSAG.
- Landscape/Wildlife scientific advisory group (LWAG)- Jim McCracken.
 1. Resampling RMZ study sites.
 2. Characterization of seeps used by stream associated amphibians.
 3. Tailed frog meta-analysis.

The RMZ study would involve resampling of sites established during the TFW RMZ study several years ago.
- In-stream scientific advisory group (ISAG)- Brian Fransen.
 1. Fish habitat model development.
 - A. GIS support
 - B. Continued support for DNR data collector.
 - C. Field survey funding.

It was decided that all three of these items were tasks needed to complete the fish habitat model and should be treated as a single project. ISAG had no other projects ready to present that had been reviewed and discussed, but will be reviewing a proposal to assess culvert/fish passage at their next meeting.
- Wetland scientific advisory group (WETSAG)- Dave Parks
 1. Forested wetland literature review and synthesis
 2. Forested wetland workshop
 3. Retrospective study of forested wetland response to management

This group has only been meeting for a short time but identified steps needed for additional work on forested wetland issues.
- Upland processes scientific advisory group (UPSAG)- Mike Liquori
 1. Type N streams
 2. Tools for mass wasting risk assessment
 3. Road program development

UPSAG project list identifies topic areas that will be scoped further to identify more specific project proposals.
- Bulltrout scientific advisory group (BSAG)- Terry Jackson
 1. Eastside nomograph/temperature model
 2. Forest practices effects on groundwater
 3. Comparison of shade/water temperature between bull trout habitat and standard eastside Type F prescriptions.
 4. Type N and F baseline effectiveness monitoring for shade and temperature.
 5. Bull trout radiotelemetry.

6. Eastside data for last fish model.
7. Effective shade-canopy cover comparison.

BSAG was allowed to submit more than three projects because USFWS is bringing in a substantial block of funding which must be spent on bulltrout related projects.

Project 1 (eastside nomograph/temperature model) is the same as the third project proposed by RSAG so the two were combined.

After the presentations, CMER members present voted on the projects. Grizzel and Schuett-Hames refrained from voting due to their staff support role for CMER. The following table lists the projects in order of their rank and shows the score and the SAG(s) in charge of implementation.

Results of February 23, 2001 CMER prioritization process.

Rank	Score	Project	SAG
1	84	Fish habitat model development	ISAG
2	79	DFC target validation (westside)	RSAG
3	37	Eastside riparian disturbance regimes	ERSAG
4	29	Resampling RMZ study sites	LWAG
5	25	Type N streams (PIP)	UPSAG
6	21	Type N & F baseline effectiveness monitoring for shade/temperature	BTSAG
7	20	Eastside stream temperature model	RSAG/ERSAG
8 (tie)	17	Forested wetland literature review and synthesis	WETSAG
8 (tie)	17	Road program development	UPSAG
10	15	Perennial initiation points (eastside)	ERSAG/UPSAG
11	13	Characterization of seeps used by stream associated amphibians	LWAG
12	12	Forest practices effects on groundwater	BTSAG
13	10	Tools for mass wasting risk assessment	UPSAG
14	8	Retrospective study of forested wetland response to management	WETSAG
15 (tie)	5	Forested wetland workshop	WETSAG
15 (tie)	5	Comparison of shade/water temperature between bull trout habitat and standard eastside Type F prescriptions	BTSAG
17	1	Densimeter protocol development	RSAG
18	1	Tailed frog meta-analysis	LWAG
19	0	Bull trout radiotelemetry	BTSAG

Next steps.

We discussed the idea that while the prioritized project list is only the first iteration, SAGs should begin writing full study plans for at least the top 10 projects as these projects have the highest likelihood of being funded. Remember that some of these proposals will need peer review (at SAG's and/or CMER's discretion) before being funded and that the Scientific Review Team for CMER is still in concept form. Thus each SAG will probably need to coordinate its own reviews while allowing enough time for CMER to look at those reviews before final funding decisions are made (take home message is begin study plan development now)

Importantly, identification of CMER's top priorities (high on the project list) should allow opportunities for **all** interested SAGs to be involved in final project design. For example at least 4 of the top projects include work in Type N streams. If your SAG has a

research agenda that includes type N issues (even if they were not high on the current list) then you need to meet with the lead SAG (UPSAG in this case) to see if your research needs can be accommodated. This coordination is critical to our success in gaining efficiencies and in crafting the best possible projects.

Quinn asks the SAG who sponsored one of the top 10 projects (actually the top 11 if policy decides not to fund the study to resample the RMZ sites) to begin setting up coordination meetings where all interested SAGS can help craft a study plan.

The next CMER meeting is scheduled for March 28. Location to be announced.